

CPYRGHT

"Shooting From the Hip"

Your editorial of Sept. 15, is a further example of the continued indulgence by *The Washington Post* in what it likes to call McCarthyism when practiced by others.

My Senate speech about the recent address of Dr. Ralph K. White, Chief of the Soviet Bloc Division of USIA's Office of Research and Analysis, referred to a dozen or more specific statements of Dr. White and made specific criticisms of those statements. *The Washington Post* ignores all this and picks out a rather routine and non-controversial thesis of Dr. White's, pretending that this was the object of my critique.

Few will argue with Dr. White's contention that we must try to gain "a realistic, imaginative understanding of how the world looks from a Communist point of view." While this idea may seem novel and exciting to Dr. White and your paper, it is basic to anyone who concerns himself with the cold war. What I did object to in Dr. White's speech, I spelled out clearly, and since your editorial chose to ignore these specific criticisms, I shall restate them now.

Dr. White contends that Soviet aggression in Berlin and around the world originates partly in defensive fear and in a sincere desire to stabilize the cold war conflict; that we are too inclined to look upon Communist leaders as villains; that we overestimate their evil; that we should not dismiss the words of Soviet leaders as lies because most of the time what they say is close to what they really think."

White leaves a clear implication that differences in the relative moral standing between Soviet Russia and the United States are of degree and he lists the U.S. flights and our efforts to help Cuban freedom fighters as proofs that we are not unlike the Reds. And throughout his remarks, he indicates that the Russian people are the same

basic outlook and attitude as their Communist leaders.

If these views were the speculations of some obscure academician talking to his fellows, they would still be subject to the give and take of criticism. But when they come from the man who is charged with advising the USIA on the best means of bringing the American message to the world with respect to the Soviet Union, then this is a matter which calls either for the dismissal of Dr. White or the announcement by our Government that it has rejected the basic premises upon which our postwar policy of resistance to Communist aggression has been based.

My criticisms of Dr. White's remarks, briefly stated, are as follows:

Communist aggression in Berlin and around the world is based not on their legitimate or even imagined fears of the Free World but on their off-expressed intention to bury the Free World and subjugate it to communism.

We are not inclined to overestimate the evil of the Communists; we are inclined to underestimate it. How can you exaggerate the evil of men who have murdered 20 million of their own people, who have enslaved hundreds of millions of others, who have destroyed the independence and national life of a dozen nations, who have systematically committed every form of villainy known to man?

Soviet leaders are not saying what they really think. Their approach to their own people and to the rest of the world is one of calculated deceit. Thus, they have broken more than one thousand treaties solemnly agreed to; they have deliberately lied about germ warfare in Korea, about alleged U. S. aggression all over the world, and about disarmament. They lie consciously and deliberately every day of every week of every month of every year.

We need not condemn our country for either the

flights or for the assistance to the Cuban freedom fighters. The one was a necessary action to protect ourselves from surprise attack, the other was a fulfillment of a moral obligation to help a once free people liberate themselves from a Communist dictatorship, sustained in power by Communist arms.

Finally, my belief, contrary to that of Dr. White, is that the Russian people and all peoples enslaved by communism do not share the same outlook and beliefs as their enslavers.

Thus, the incredible defection of several million Russian troops to the Nazis during World War II, the exodus from East Germany, the mass defection of Soviet troops to the side of freedom during the Hungarian uprising, the multi-billion dollar jamming program by which the Communists prevent news from getting to their people, the most highly developed system of terror in history, that would certainly not be necessary if, as Dr. White alleges, the Soviet people shared the attitudes of their masters.

This was the substance of my speech, and the particulars of which *The Washington Post* chose to omit in its critical editorial.

As for your assumption that I did not read the complete White text, I wish to assure you that I read it carefully, just as I am sure you read it carefully.

The essential difference between you and me is that you share these theories of Dr. White and I reject them. This is the real basis for your continuing attacks upon me. Since you decided to ridicule my views, it would have been more manful to debate them openly, point by point, rather than make a sneak, hit-and-run attack with a dose of innuendo and personal vilification which ducked all the vital questions involved.

THOMAS J. DODD,
Senator from Connecticut